

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



COMMUNIST REVISIONISM AND DISSIDENCE (4)

Summary No. 2815

23 September 1960

Prepared by

Foreign Documents Division
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
2430 E St., N. W., Washington 25, D. C.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

W A R N I N G

THIS MATERIAL CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE
OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE LAWS,
TITLE 18, USC, SECS. 793 AND 794, THE TRANSMISSION OR REVELATION OF
WHICH IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

COMMUNIST REVISIONISM AND DISSIDENCE (4)

This report contains material on Communist revisionism and dissidence as reflected in Communist and non-Communist sources. The latest source date used herein is 25 August 1960.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Part 1. USSR	1
Soviet "Revisionism" Defended	1
Part 2. Far East	6
I. China	6
Unity of Opposites	6
II. North Vietnam	8
Bloc Unity Versus Internal Problems	8
III. Outer Mongolia	11
Revisionism, Dogmatism, and Nationalism	11
Part 3. Eastern Europe	13
I. Bulgaria	13
Book on Cultural "Hypocrisy" Abroad Again Reviewed Favorably	13
II. East Germany	15
Discussions on Economic Revisionism	15
Discussions on Philosophic Revisionism	16
III. Hungary	21
Revisionist Pressures on Literary Policy, Peaceful Coexistence Line; Looks in New Light	21

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

	<u>Page</u>
IV. Rumania	24
Duties of Literary Criticism in Fighting Revisionism	24
V. Yugoslavia	24
Coexistence and War	24
Part 4. Western Europe	28
Denmark	28
Dissident Criticism of Soviet "Rocket Rattling"	28

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 1. USSR

Soviet "Revisionism" Defended

An article in FDD Summary No 2666, Communist Revisionism and Dissidence (2), pointed out that "revisionism" had reappeared in the USSR. "Current revisionism in the USSR is, in reality, an extension of the modifications of Lenin's doctrine on war and peace adopted at the 20th and 21st party congresses. Revisionism in the USSR today constitutes Khrushchev's reaffirmation of his interpretation of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the inevitability of war and Lenin's doctrine on the methods used for the seizure of power, i. e., revolution by violence." (page 1) The article also said that "the CPSU and its leaders, supporting Khrushchev's revisionist proclamations, have endeavored to point out that his theses on peaceful coexistence, disarmament, and the noninevitability of war are not new theses, for Lenin had maintained the same theses following the Civil War and was always in favor of peaceful coexistence." (page 3)

Since the publication of Summary No 2666, new information in the Soviet press on this subject alters the conclusions drawn at that time. Although, in theory, it is correct to conclude that any changes made in the interpretation or application of Marxism-Leninism are viewed as revisionism by doctrinaire Communists, Soviet leaders today maintain that current modifications and interpretations of Marxism-Leninism are in effect "creative applications of Marxism-Leninism." On 12 August 1960, Pravda pointed out: "... The founders of scientific Communism, Marx, Engels, and Lenin, stressed that their teaching is not dogma, but a guide to action, that it must be developed in conformity with the changes which take place in public life. Since the creation of the world-wide system of socialism, the situation in the world has changed radically." On the same day, Izvestiya declared: "Marxism-Leninism does not suffer dogmatism. It is pure creation. The great merit of the Central Committee CPSU, headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, lies in the fact that it consistently carries out Leninism in practice, that it creatively develops Marxist-Leninist theory. This line of the CPSU meets with the unanimous support in the world Communist and workers movement."

The contention is that since far-reaching changes have taken place in the world in recent years, the current interpretation of Marxism-Leninism must conform to these changes. Consequently, the Soviet press maintains that any changes in the interpretation of Marxism-Leninism which conform to the changes in the world situation are not to be considered as revisionism but as "creative applications of Marxism-Leninism" to these changes. On the contrary, the press states, those who fail to see the validity and need for these interpretive changes are revisionists. "The strength of the Communist and workers parties is that they unflinchingly hold to Marxist-Leninist ideology and irreconcilably struggle both against revisionism and dogmatic-sectarianism, which contradicts the creative character of Marxism-Leninism." (Moscow, Sovetskiy Flot, 9 Aug 60)

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Since the CPSU, and especially Khrushchev, has recently been accused of revisionism, the Soviet Press has accelerated its campaign to prove that the current Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence and its stand on the noninevitability of war are valid and practical interpretations of Marxism-Leninism in the light of the present world situation. Press articles point out that Lenin "...considered the policy of peaceful coexistence the general course of the socialist state's foreign policy. The CPSU struggles consistently for the triumph of Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence." (Moscow, Pravda, 12 Aug 60) They also stress that "...Lenin's well-known tenet on the aggressive nature of imperialism, that the threat of war will exist as long as capitalism exists, is still applicable in our days, as was emphasized by the decisions of the 20th and 21st CPSU congresses. Now, under new conditions, however, imperialism, though far from altering its aggressive nature, has lost its former capabilities of playing the master in the world arena, while the capabilities of the socialist camp for keeping the aggressors under control are steadily growing. The socialist states, conducting a policy of peace, and all peace-loving nations, if they are duly watchful and well-organized, can prevent another world war...." (Moscow, Sovetskiy Flot, 9 Aug 60)

An article in the No 10, July 1960, issue of Kommunist pointed out that Lenin himself had maintained that Marx's theory was not inviolable: "While carrying on a determined struggle against all the sundry opportunists, Lenin at the same time did not fear to raise his hand at some of the obsolete theoretical conclusions and generalizations which had lost their truth and power with the advent of the new epoch and had become contradictory to the changed objective conditions. Lenin, the greatest revolutionary in politics and in philosophy, taught us that 'We do not by any means regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable....'" The same article further showed that in "...fighting against the right-wing dogmatists and doctrinaires of the Plekhanov and Kautskiy type, Lenin held up to ridicule their pedantism, their devotion to lifeless, bookish wisdom and scholasticism, their efforts to substitute abstract formulas and schemes, empty and lifeless phrases, and references to one or another quotation for a concrete historical analysis of the new social conditions and of new social phenomena. To ignore the changed circumstances, wrote Lenin, '...[and] to go on advocating the old solutions given by Marxism is to be true to the letter and not to the spirit of the teaching, is to repeat by rote the old conclusions without being able to use the Marxian method for analyzing the new political situation....'"

The authors of the same article summarize the Soviet stand on this subject: "The new Marxist standpoint that wars are not fatally inevitable in our time is intrinsically connected with the Leninist theory of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems...."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In its effort to prove that current Soviet policies are correct in respect to Marxism-Leninism and are not revisionistic, the Soviet press stressed that the balance of power today has shifted in favor of the socialist camp and that imperialism no longer possesses the power to determine whether there will be wars or not: "We declare that at present there is no fatalist inevitability of war and that war may be prevented and forever excluded from public life. Our view has a solid basis. It reflects the fundamental changes in the relation of political, economic, and class forces in the international arena, changes in favor of socialism. Dogmatists and sectarians do not agree with this -- the only correct Marxist view. They consider this view to be a deviation from the principal positions of the working people's class struggle. Brandishing quotations from Marxist-Leninist classics they attempt to demonstrate that as long as imperialism exists one cannot escape its willfulness and excesses. They assert that now, as before, it depends only on imperialism whether there will be wars or not.... It is obvious that by its very essence imperialism remains the same as ever. But it is not difficult also to see that its aggressive capabilities have been considerably diminished...." (Moscow, Sel'skaya Zhizn', 24 Aug 60)

In its attempt to vindicate the CPSU of accusations of revisionist tendencies in respect to the question of the noninevitability of war, the Soviet press asserted: "It is impossible to conduct a successful struggle for peace today by relying mechanically on the old thesis about wars being inevitable in the epoch of imperialism. This thesis was the result of a scientific analysis of imperialism in the period when it was an all-embracing world system. It was still true at that time when the Soviet Union was the only socialist country in the midst of a hostile capitalist world. The situation is different today. Capitalism is no longer the system which alone has the power to rule historic destines of the peoples...." (Kommunist, No 10, Jul 60) "Yes, there is now a real possibility of muzzling the raging enemies of peace. Only people who are unable to distinguish yesterday from today can say that wars are inevitable now, as before, and that imperialism and its general staffs are free as before to decide arbitrarily whether there shall be war or peace. No, that time is over. Another power, more impressive than imperialism, the socialist world system, now has its say on the question of war and peace, a power which has become a determining factor in world politics. Peoples who hate war now decide this question...." (Moscow, Sovetskaya Rossiya, 17 Aug 60)

Having asserted this position, the Soviet press charged that those who see the present situation differently are revisionists: "The indisputable facts of life fully disprove the theories of revisionists and reformists who stress that imperialism has changed and is no longer aggressive, that it has turned from a beast of prey into a meek lamb. Only notorious fawners over imperialism are capable of pretending that its predatory

grin and hypocrisy are a love of peace. But since the nature of imperialism remains the same, does this mean that another world war is inevitable? Some 'skeptics' reckon that it will result with fatalistic inevitability from the very essence of imperialism. As long as capitalism exists, they say, it means that there cannot be world peace. Those who advocate this viewpoint evaluate the present epoch in a biased and incorrect manner, dogmatically repeating the general formulas on imperialism which were worked out 50 years ago. But much has changed since then. International life has undergone thorough changes. The epoch of the disintegration of imperialism has set in...." (Sovetskaya Rossiya, 17 Aug 60)

Further defending the CPSU, the Soviet press claimed: "The CPSU and other Communist and workers parties severely censured the revisionists who allege that imperialism has lost its aggressive nature. The revisionists assert that the imperialists no longer strive for the seizure of other people's riches and for enslavement of other nations. According to them, modern capitalism has become 'democratic' and 'popular.' Such anti-Marxist and antiscientific views are harmful to the interests of the working people and the Communist movement...." (Sel'skaya Zhizn, 24 Aug 60)

To underline the hegemony of the CPSU in the international Communist movement and to show that its policies on peaceful coexistence, the noninevitability of war, and the nature of imperialism are correct and have been unanimously accepted throughout the socialist camp, Izvestiya on 12 August 1960 stated: "The July plenum of the Central Committee CPSU has unanimously adopted a resolution approving the communique of the Bucharest conference and the political line and activity of the CPSU delegation headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev at that conference. It is generally known with what resolution the CPSU and all Marxist-Leninists unmask the modern revisionists and reformists who shut their eyes to imperialism's aggressiveness and assert that imperialism is no longer what it was in the times of Marx and Lenin, that it has become 'better' and 'not dangerous.' The revisionists are thereby suggesting to the nations that it is not worth their while to waste efforts on the struggle for peace, that peace will consolidate itself 'by itself.'"

In defending the CPSU from revisionist allegations, the Soviet press was forced to resolve a dual position, i. e., attacking those revisionists who maintain (1) that imperialism has lost its aggressiveness, not because of the emerging deterrent power of the socialist camp, but through design and evolution and (2) that imperialism has not lost any of its aggressiveness, but on the contrary has augmented its aggressive nature. The former, according to the press, has been attributed to Yugoslavia and certain Western Communist groups, and the latter to Communist China.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The above situation has been resolved apparently to the point where the principal press attacks have been levied against Communist China, which has recently accused the USSR of following a policy of revisionism in respect to the tenets of true Marxism-Leninism. On 16 August 1960 in an article in Bakinskiy Rabochiy, Communist China was openly called to task: "During the period when the USSR was the only country of proletarian dictatorship in the world, it was unable to rely on direct economic or military aid from anyone. The workers class and the working peasantry in the USSR could depend only on their own forces and resources, both in building a socialist economy and ensuring the military safety of the country. The present situation is entirely different. In its struggle for socialism, the workers class of any country is well aware of the fact that it will always receive fraternal support from the Soviet Union as from the whole socialist camp. Lenin's teachings on the victory of socialism in individual countries must be considered today as being inseparably linked to the successes of the socialist camp. Would it be possible to imagine the successful building of socialism under present conditions even in such a great country as, for instance, China, if this country were in an isolated position and not supported by the cooperation and mutual aid of all other socialist countries? Such a country, while being subjected to an economic blockade by capitalist countries, would at the same time be open to military attacks from without. It would experience the greatest difficulty even in the event it should withstand the furious onslaught of the enemy."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 2. FAR EAST

I. CHINA

Unity of Opposites

The two "revisionist" controversies carried by the Chinese Communist Political and intellectual periodicals in 1960 have been over the advocacy by "revisionists" of humanitarianism in literature and over whether there is any unity between thought and existence. The periodicals which have carried articles on the first controversy have included the Wen-i Pao, No 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 and Hsin Chien-she, No 6 and 7; the periodicals which have carried articles on the controversy over the unity of thought and existence and its direct bearing on the law of the unity of opposites and contradictions have included Hsin Chien-she, No 6, Hung-ch'i, No 4 and 11; and numerous issues of Che-hsueh Yen-chiu, beginning with the late 1959 issues.

A third theme, attacks on "modern revisionists" for preaching the possibility of peaceful coexistence, has been associated with foreign policies and has up to now been clearly distinct from the first two controversies. However, the 1 August issue of Hung-ch'i contains an article by Kuan Feng entitled "On the Unity of Opposites" which makes an unexpected link between the domestic revisionists who refuse to acknowledge the universal applicability of the law of the unity of opposites to the pair of thought and existence and the foreign "modern revisionists," who, this particular article claims by strong implication, have failed to recognize that wars are almost to be expected rather than just possible or preventable in this age because the revisionists have failed to apply the law of the unity of opposites to the opposites of war and peace.

The author, Kuan Feng, is unidentified, but he has written articles for the Jen-min Jih-pao (for example, the article "On the Political Significance of Diligence and Frugality," on 23 August) and is probably a spokesman for the regime on philosophical subjects.

Kuan's thesis is that the law of the unity of opposites, with the unity achieved through the mechanism of the dialectical method and with contradictions being merely another way of describing the existence of opposites, has not been properly understood by some people. These have therefore fallen prey to an entire series of errors with the common characteristic of having arisen from failure to apply the law of the unity of opposites in each case of error. This failure, in turn, has been due to the retention, by these people, of the bourgeois metaphysical concept of absolute opposition, that is, that unity is unity and opposition is opposition and that one opposite cannot change into the other.

The proper understanding of the law, Kuan said, is that unity can come only from the prior existence of sets of opposites or contradictions and that it is the movement from contradictions to unity and back to contradictions and further unity which constitutes history, including revolutionary changes.

Kuan then took up concrete cases where misunderstanding of the law of the unity of opposites has led to errors.

He made passing reference to the controversy of more than half a year's standing, over the unity of thought and existence, one of the cases, but said that he would not take up this particular application of the law because the case has already been discussed by so many comrades.

Of the cases Kuan took up, the three with the most interesting policy implications were the application of the law to the issue of war and peace, to revolutionary changes, and to the recognition of contradictions.

To Kuan, there is a unity between war and peace by definition, because they are opposites. The existence of the concept for one presupposes the existence of the concept for the other. He admitted that there will be no "war" when the imperialist-capitalist system is truly eliminated and when classes have been truly eliminated, but at the same time denied that this is an admission that in a class society like that of the present, war and peace do not exist together as a pair. On the contrary, the admission proves just the opposite.

War and peace, said Kuan, are special forms of the class struggle and being opposites, can change into each other under certain circumstances in accordance with the law of the unity of opposites. Permanent peace is therefore an impossibility in the present [world understood] class society. It is precisely because peace can change to war that the socialist camp with the Soviet Union as the head, the international workers, and the peoples of the world must exert themselves to prevent wars, protect peace, and carry out unceasing struggles.

War, said Kuan, is a product of class society and has its roots in the capitalist system. The capitalists use peace to deceive peoples and to oppress and exploit them. The proletariat and peoples of the various countries, on the contrary, expose the imperialists and prevent the outbreak of war, and struggle for a just peace, democracy, and socialism. No "class cooperation" or "social peace" is possible, being only the myths of modern capitalists and revisionists for deceiving the people. Neither one exists nor is possible.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Kuan Feng has thus used a theoretical argument against the possibility of peaceful coexistence that, so far as is known in FDD, has been unique among the Chinese Communist arguments.

The second case, on revolutionary changes, is explained very simply by Kuan. Such changes, he said, can only be understood in the light of the law of the unity of opposites, which teaches that the changes which constitute revolutions arise from the prior existence of opposites. The interesting point Kuan made was that these changes can be "promoted" by those who "use the objective dialectical method and create conditions for promoting the completion of revolutionary changes. This is true in the revolution for the seizing of political power and eliminating capitalism, as well as in constructing of socialism. The facts of the great leaps forward...have proven in an extraordinarily fresh manner the law that opposites change into each other. We have used this law to bring out the significance of the function of subjective motive power."

Kuan has thus tied the law of the unity of opposites to two of the basic measures of the regime, that is, denial of the possibility of peaceful coexistence and exaltation of the role of "subjective motive power" or revolutionary enthusiasm.

As a final point, Kuan asserted that failure to recognize that unity arises from opposites is also responsible for denials by some people that contradictions exist in a socialist society between both the people themselves and between enemy classes.

II. NORTH VIETNAM

Bloc Unity Versus Internal Problems

The North Vietnamese stand of neutrality in the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute is clearly demonstrated in the press survey made between 16 July and 16 August 1960. The press and party leaders have once again carefully avoided any statements partial to either the USSR or Communist China, and instead have emphasized the "solidarity and unity of mind among the Communist and workers' parties in the socialist camp."

A typical example of the neutrality of the North Vietnam regime is the statement made by Premier Pham Van Dong on 15 August at a banquet given by the North Korean Ambassador Chon Ch'ang-ch'ol on the 15th anniversary of Korea's "liberation." In this speech, which appeared in Nhan Dan on 16 August, Pham Van Dong leaned over backward to avoid taking sides with either of the disputants by praising the struggle of the masses of Asia, Africa, and Latin America against US "imperialism" to achieve "a

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

policy of agreement internally and peace and neutrality externally," on the one hand, while, on the other hand, stating that "the Vietnamese people and the DRV [Democratic Republic of Vietnam] government warmly welcome and support the Soviet proposal for general and complete disarmament and regard it as a great device for preventing war and preserving peace. The Vietnamese people and the DRV government warmly welcome and support the proposal of the government of the People's Republic of China that all countries in Asia and in the Pacific area, including the US, sign a peace pact of mutual nonaggression and transform this area into an area of nuclear weapons."

Also indicative of this attitude and of the emphasis on unity within the socialist bloc is another statement made by Pham Van Dong at a reception given on 22 July by the Polish Ambassador Tadeusz Findzinski in honor of the 16th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of Poland. According to the 23 July issue of Nhan Dan, on this occasion, Pham Van Dong said: "In the present international situation, the Soviet Union and our socialist bloc as a whole are determined to pursue persistently a policy of peace and to expose and defeat all aggressive and war-provoking attempts of the imperialists, especially the US imperialists. The Soviet Union and our socialist bloc as a whole wholeheartedly support the anti-imperialist movement which is growing powerfully everywhere."

The subject of unity was again stressed in an editorial in the 16 August issue of Nhan Dan which stated that "The communique of the 18th Plenum of the Central Committee of our party concerning the Bucharest meeting demonstrates clearly the complete agreement of our party with the Bucharest decisions on the world situation and on the importance of strengthening unity among all Communist and workers' parties, and among all socialist countries led by the Soviet Union."

The editorial cited the splendid achievements of the USSR, China, and all countries in the socialist bloc which "every day are strengthening the socialist system." It noted that over recent years, the world balance of power has "tipped to the side of peace, democracy, national independence, and socialism. The possibility of maintaining peace, and of preventing another world war is increasing every day."

Throughout the period of this survey, the press each day carried several articles bitterly denouncing the US for its "acts of aggression," and for its "plots to create war" in Japan, Cuba, the Congo, Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam, but never did it say that war was inevitable.

Internationally, North Vietnam to date has shown no signs of revisionism, but domestically the regime could be having some trouble. Although no specific charges were made, To Huu a member of the Central Committee Secretariat, in an article in the June Hoc Tap, stated that "in our society and in our party there is still much nonproletarian ideology which is an

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

obstacle to the revolution.... if for one minute we fail to concentrate on the education of the members of our society, we could have a disaster such as occurred in 1956. [In 1956 many contributors to the cultural publications Nhan Van and Giai Pham were arrested for their "reactionary viewpoints" and the periodicals were banned by government order.]

The problem of internal revisionism might be a real one because To Huu devotes this entire article in the party theoretical journal to the need for ideological, cultural, and technical education for all the people to wipe out "existing bourgeois traces."

On this point he said: "Although the basic spirit of the party is proletarian, there remain strong traces of petty bourgeois ideology: the class viewpoint is vague, vacillating, and confused in the face of difficulties...it is removed from reality and far from the masses. We cannot ignore the fact that in their economic and cultural activities, a number of cadres manifest a bourgeois point of view."

To overcome these weaknesses, according to To Huu, cadres must "study and understand the party policy lines on ideology, culture, and techniques. They must devote themselves to study, and must make every effort to create a large group of cadres from the working class who are absolutely loyal to socialism and have a strong party spirit....

"At the same time, our party will make every effort to help the 'old' intellectuals to cultivate proper points of view and conduct, and will make it possible for them to grow professionally and make their work most successful....

"We must struggle ceaselessly to resist the erroneous concepts in ideology, culture, and science that exist among a number of our 'old' intellectuals. Our struggle in this respect has been weak. Only by a deep ideological struggle can we develop our culture, education, and science strongly and quickly."

Thus, while there have been no open manifestations of revisionism or dissidence, To Huu's deep concentration on this subject would seem to indicate that it does exist.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

III. OUTER MONGOLIA

Revisionism, Dogmatism, and Nationalism

On 14 August 1960, an article was published in Unen called "Correct Understanding of the Present Era," by G. Chimid and S. Udbal, member of the Presidium of the Great National Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic. Some of the features emphasized in the article are as follows:

At present, we live in a period of unforeseeable changes and events, most of which have their origin in the difficulties produced during the transition from the class society of capitalism to the classless society of socialism. Today, the struggle for peace and the desire to avert war have created a situation whereby this subject-matter has become a basic feature in national policy. In general, changes throughout the world continue to favor socialism. Capitalism is on the wane, and the colonial system is fast disappearing. A billion people live in a vast area, extending from the Arctic Ocean to the tropics of Vietnam, as well as from the Adriatic to the China Sea. This area is the homeland of the socialist camp.

The Congress of Communist and Workers Parties, which met in Moscow in 1957, pointed out the following: "The outstanding event of our era was the great socialist October revolution which took place in Russia and which set the pattern for the transition from capitalism to socialism. The existence of the two opposite social systems in competition with each other explains the situation we observe today." However, at present, there are revisionists and dogmatists whose interpretations of world affairs differ greatly. Some of them go to extremes in expressing their opinions. Revisionists emphasize economic competition or cooperation, but pay less attention to the class struggle or the problems of transition from capitalism to socialism. The dogmatists, on the other hand, analyze the present only to advocate the destruction of imperialism by means of all-out war.

It is well to remember what Lenin said with regard to eras throughout the course of history. "During any period, past or future, there are times when one may move forward, and there are times when it is better to retreat. Therefore, if a movement is falling apart, the solution is to twist and turn in as many directions as necessary to accomplish one's ends. Under such circumstances, no historical movement can develop both rapidly and successfully at the same time. Whatever class is dominant during a given era, the course of development can only be planned by knowing thoroughly the basic facts of the situation so that the historical significance of the period can be recognized for what it is. If the actual nature of the era is known and one is properly oriented within it, it then becomes possible to establish tactics which are effective."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Correct understanding of the present era requires a thorough knowledge of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. The views of dogmatists are one-sided if they interpret the present epoch as one of imperialism and wars only, to the exclusion of all other factors. Imperialism has declined and can no longer be regarded as a world power. Socialism, on the other hand, has spread over a large part of the world and is still exerting great influence over people outside of the socialist camp. Under present international conditions, there are two choices, either war or peaceful coexistence; there is no third choice. V. I. Lenin stated the following: "When military technology has reached a point sufficient to produce mass destruction, at such a time it becomes impossible to carry out a successful general war." The opinions of those who throw doubt on the policy of peaceful coexistence should be placed in the category of faulty reasoning. It should be remembered that socialism and aggression are opposites which are not compatible with each other. The destructive power of contemporary weapons represents a change which has to be taken into account. One of the most important aims of socialism consists of peaceful construction.

Lenin always supported the doctrine of peaceful coexistence among nations having different social systems. At present, the foreign policy of all socialist countries is based on this principle. The Soviet Union has taken the lead by setting an excellent example for all the world to observe. Khrushchev made the following statement with regard to international peace and security: "The struggle for a world outlook, the interests of humanity, and decisions of importance affecting the future are to continue along the path of peaceful coexistence with all countries, irrespective of their social systems. Moreover, it is necessary to support this situation resolutely by setting a convincing example to others, and not by means of world-wide military power." The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party supports the views held in Moscow with regard to the elimination of war. The balance of power on the international scene favors the possibility of avoiding major military operations. The problem of total disarmament throughout the world is one that should be studied carefully. The Soviet Union has set an example by reducing armed forces unilaterally. Total disarmament, however, is a matter which can only be obtained by means of peaceful negotiation.

The transition to socialism should not rely solely on warfare. The basic principles of Marxism-Leninism recognize peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. The nature of the transition depends largely on local conditions with regard to both time and place. The only way to preserve the essence of Marxism-Leninism is to take a strong ideological stand against the extreme views of revisionists, dogmatists, and nationalists. The total victory of socialism and peace requires much effort and a better understanding of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 3. EASTERN EUROPE

The East European press is concerned with evidences of revisionism in connection with the problem of peaceful coexistence and in the areas of culture, economics, and philosophy.

In an atmosphere of heightened Sino-Soviet tensions on the problem of peaceful coexistence, the Hungarian and Yugoslav press denounce manifestations which are in opposition to the Soviet line on this question. A Hungarian author attacks those who deviate from the Soviet peaceful coexistence line by their assertion that "a uniform socialist transformation is taking place throughout the world." Edvard Kardelj, the Yugoslav Vice-President, points to Chinese "impudent distortions" of scientific socialism on the subject of war and peace in his denunciation of Chinese attacks on Yugoslav revisionism.

The problem of cultural revisionism is dealt with in the Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Rumanian press. In Bulgaria, an attack on cultural revisionism abroad, especially in Yugoslavia, is reviewed favorably. In Hungary, the proponents of literary modernism are denounced for failing to discern the "radical novelty of the new socialist reality," and there is also a quotation of a French Communist criticism of Lukacs which is in direct opposition to previous Hungarian and other criticisms of him. In Rumania, two Writers Union publications cite the dangers of revisionism in literature and call on critics to combat it on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

With regard to economic and philosophical revisionism, the East German press contains recent additional discussions of and by two accused economic revisionists whom the party had dealt with 3 years ago. The leading East German philosophical journal attacks a "profoundly revisionistic" work on materialist dialectic by a Czech author.

I. BULGARIA

Book on Cultural "Hypocrisy" Abroad Again Reviewed Favorably

Twice previously favorably reviewed (see Summary No 2619, Eastern Europe Press Survey (107), pp 7-10), Ivan Ruzh's Zakonut na literaturnite dzhungli (The Law of the Literary Jungles), published by "Bulgarski pisatel" Publishing Enterprise, Sofia, 1959, is the recipient of accolades for the third time to date, by Sv. Buchvarova in Rabotnicheskoe Delo, 17 July 1960, for its allegedly skillful indictment of cultural "hypocrisy" and revisionism abroad.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Despite the apparent success and importance being attached to Ruzh's "offensive in socialist culture," Ruzh, who is deputy chief editor, of Plamuk, monthly periodical of the Union of Bulgarian Writers, and recipient of the union's 1959 award for the aforementioned book's contribution to the field of literary theory and criticism, has himself been the target of criticism, as evidenced in the article, "Ivan Ruzh Fights Against Dogmatism," by Stoyan Karolev, published in Plamuk, No 6, 1960.

Karolev, in a detailed refutation of criticisms levied previously against his work by Ruzh, describes Ruzh as "a criticizer of critics who has not written anything creative for many years," and charges that "regrettably, his critiques suffer from the same shortcomings which abound in his previous creative work, i.e., apologetics and dogmatism." He adds that "Ruzh, in his attacks against critics, loves to pose as an antidogmatist, but the cultured reader can hardly be deceived, since Ruzh, in his articles against dogmatism, inevitably manifests dogmatism." Karolev concludes that "the correct and productive development of Bulgarian literary critiques requires discussions and controversies, but to argue as Ivan Ruzh does in his articles, is quite unprofitable, if not even detrimental." Ruzh and Karolev were elected members of the presidium of the Union of Bulgarian Writers at the 8 July 1960 electoral meeting of the writers union.

Excerpted below is that portion of Buchvarova's review in Rabotnichesko Delo which deals specifically with Ruzh's critique of Yugoslav revisionism.

"The author of this militant book not only conscientiously exposes the cultural facts of life in the West which are harmful to bourgeois ideology and reality, but also knows how to point out the contradictions in both the opposition's concepts and in its practices and knows how to reveal the intentional omissions and distortions of real facts. This is particularly valid in his articles against revisionism. Ruzh, in a reply to Yugoslav revisionist Risto Tosovic, writes, 'There are production novels in Soviet literature, but Tosovic can turn to the French literature of the 1930s to find whole piles of production novels in the most literal sense of the word. There are even theorists on these novels. However, to date, it has not occurred to anyone to accuse the whole of French literature of this crime. However, as soon as the question of Soviet literature comes up, the existence of some shortcoming in some authors or works is declared a flaw in the whole of Soviet literature.'

"The author also exposes revisionist complaints on the 'oppressive' critical beginning in [early?] Soviet literature. Ruzh writes, 'Can the Yugoslav critic remember the title of at least one Yugoslav novel in which current Yugoslav reality is portrayed in a negative or gloomy light? In articles hitting at the cult of the personality in literature,

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

which articles appeared after the 20th Congress of the CPSU in Soviet periodicals, it was emphasized why writers were unable to refute this manifestation [cult of personality]. Now, such works are appearing; for example, Bitva na puti (Struggle Along the Way), by G. Nikolayeva. But, will the fastidious Tosovic permit us to ask him whether and in which works Yugoslav writers reflect the purges carried out in Yugoslavia?"

II. EAST GERMANY

Discussions on Economic Revisionism

In noting the self-criticism of the former economic revisionists, Fritz Behrens and Arne Benary, published in Neuer Weg, No 9, May 1960, the 1 June 1960 issue of the West German bi-monthly SBZ Archiv pointed out that the mistakes of these two economists were made over 3 years ago and that the party had settled with them in the spring of 1957. "Since Behrens and Benary were always loyal SED (Socialist Unity Party) members, they even at that time undertook self-criticism and distanced themselves from their "revisionist" views.... We therefore ask ourselves why Ulbricht at this time, 3 years after their voluntary self-criticism, is interested in publishing their new declarations of guilt." The article then surmises that just as Schirdewan, Oelssner, Selbmann, and others were Ulbricht's actual targets when he first criticized Behrens and Benary 3 years ago at the time when the regime was facing economic difficulties, so their additional self-criticism now, when East Germany is also burdened with economic problems, is a warning to higher officials who may be anticipating changes in party leadership.

In any case, it can be noted that Behrens continued to publish articles, chiefly on labor productivity, in the 1959 issues of the East German journal on economic theory, Wirtschaftswissenschaft, and that Benary, who was charged with more serious revisionist views and is still being rehabilitated through factory work, published an article in issue No 8, 1959 of this journal, entitled "An Experiment With a New Wage Form." The entire question of wages and prices, in which Marxist theory is inadequate and capitalist aspects have been proposed, for instance those on marginal analysis by the Soviet professor, Leonid V. Kantorovich (in a New York Times article of 12 June 1960), appears also in East Germany to be a more permissive field for Marxist economists, but, at the same time, one in which charges of revisionism could conceivably arise. Particular East German interest in this field is further revealed in the report of the November 1959 meeting of the economic section of the East German Academy of Sciences, to

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

which body a number of former dissenters belong, such as Behrens, Fred Oelssner, and Juergen Kuczynski. At this meeting, which was reported in issue No 1, 1960 of Wirtschaftswissenschaft, particularly Oelssner and Behrens took a leading part in describing the need for working out a correct economic price policy and the need for better methods of measuring labor productivity. At the same time, rather lengthy criticism of Behrens and Benary, charging them again with misinterpretation of Marxist economic laws, was made in an article entitled "The Essence and Use of Economic Laws" in the No 5, 1959, issue of Wirtschaftswissenschaft.

Another field in which the economic section of the Academy of Sciences appears to be particularly concerned is that of researching, to refute modern bourgeois economics. An entire special issue of Wirtschaftswissenschaft (no 7), published in May 1960 is devoted to this subject, in which critical mention is made, in two articles, of the Polish economist, Oskar Lange, as well as of K. Laski, both of whom have been considered in East Germany for some time as deviationists. Lange is particularly criticized for contending (a 1958 article published in Warsaw is cited) that the input-output analysis of the US economist Leontief is a further development of Marx's theory of reproduction. Two additional articles in No 3/4 and 6, 1959, of Wirtschaftswissenschaft were also devoted to refuting this contention.

Discussions on Philosophic Revisionism

In the field of philosophy, the following is excerpted from a lengthy criticism in Deutsche Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie, No 5, March 1960, of what is termed by the East German reviewer a "profoundly revisionistic" work written by a Czechoslovak philosopher at the time of the 20th CPSU Congress, but only recently translated into German. Its publication in East Germany at this time is particularly questionable, in view of certain points of similarity existing between the opinions of Cvekl, the Czechoslovak author, and those of East German philosophic revisionists of the 1956-1957 period.

"The work Kategorien der materialistischen Dialektik (Categories of the Materialistic Dialectic), edited by M.M. Rozental and G.M. Shtrak, closely and fruitfully connects the categories of materialistic dialectic with the general theoretical questions which have been posed by modern natural science and the development of socialism-Communism in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. This connection is missing from the study, Ueber materialistische Dialektik (On Materialistic Dialectic) by Jiri Cvekl....

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"It seems to us that the author [Cvekl] has not clarified the relation of dialectics and metaphysics, nor that of materialism and idealism. If one restricts oneself in the two above-mentioned subjects to the... fight between dialectical and antialectical thinking and also makes no qualitative differentiation between the relation of dialectics and metaphysics and the contrast between materialism and idealism, one falls into idealism which circumvents the basic question of philosophy and is directed toward method, as is the case with Kant, Hegel, the neo-Kantians, and other idealistic philosophic systems. For materialism, on the other hand, the world view as theory is the basic key from which the method is derived. The correct structure of philosophy is derived solely from the correct materialistic solution of the basic question of philosophy. Although the author creates a perfectly good basis for handling the contents and questions...of dialectic for the correct solution of the relation of idealism-materialism and metaphysics-dialectics, he is not consistent in the further treatment of the problem....

"The author asserts that the dialectic is identical with dialectical materialism and with Marxism. If it is possible to equate Marxism, dialectical materialism, and the dialectic, why do these three different concepts exist? he asks. According to the author, the equating of them has a purpose, although differences between them exist. He tries to make these differences clear.... Marxism, he says, is, as theory, a direction, a movement in the field of philosophic, economic, and socio-political thought which is derived from Karl Marx which solves in a unified way the philosophic, economic, and sociopolitical questions which arise from the struggle of the working class and which must be answered if the transition to a classless society is to be made. Materialism, on the other hand, is one of the ...basic directions in philosophy and/or science, a definite kind of world view. 'But both Marxism and materialism are ideological directions within definite scientific areas and/or within philosophy', he says. In contrast to this 'world view' or (sic!) 'dialectic' has definite areas of comprehension which pertain to a precisely defined object of comprehension and to the questions arising from this. Philosophy arises as the result of the thought research of the world, i.e.. the totality of the whole, the main forms of animate and inanimate nature, the history of society and of comprehension.

"It would be more correct to say that materialism is not just any one of the basic directions in philosophy, but rather the only scientific philosophy, if we take dialectical materialism as the basis. The equating of Marxism, world view, and dialectic we consider false. In contrast to this, the new Soviet textbook Osnovy Marksizma-Leninizma (Principles of Marxism-Leninism)...points out that Marxism-Leninism is a unified and completed teaching which embraces dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, the

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution, and the theory and history of the development of socialism and Communism. Dialectical and historical materialism is the philosophic teaching of Marxism-Leninism, the unshakable basis for the entire structure of Marxism-Leninism.

"We also do not consider it admissible to assert that 'in Marxism, philosophy is identical with dialectic, that it is dialectic and nothing more,' and that it is 'materialism, dialectic, world view, method, ontology, and epistemology.' Aside from the inadmissible introduction ...of the bourgeois concept of 'ontology' into Marxist philosophy (the attempt to 'ontologize' Marxist philosophy is found throughout the entire work)..., an equating of dialectic with world view leads to the placing of these two terms on the same level and thus to...a denial of the primacy of world view over method, as the author himself asserts on page 16. It is, however, necessary to differentiate between world view and dialectic as method. R.O. Groppe [East German philosopher] correctly asserts that world view and method are two different things. They are, of course, closely related to one another, whereby in the unity of world view and method, world view is the deciding factor....

"By ignoring the fact...that for materialism, the world view as theory is primary and method is secondary, J. Cvekl overestimates the achievements of pre-Marxist philosophy and erases the class (and thereby, qualitative) differences between Marxist and bourgeois philosophy.... It appears untenable to us to see in Hegel a 'materialistic trait,' so that the usual separation between being and consciousness, content and form, the particular and general, knowledge and practice is 'overcome.' When the author further points out that this overcoming takes place on the foundation of idealism and of the absolute spirit, then one can no longer see any 'materialistic trait.' Also untenable is the author's thesis that Kant's entire work is a critique of metaphysics. Despite the positive dialectical and materialistic elements in Kant's early writings, metaphysical traits predominate in his later works and climax in the attempt to reconcile knowledge and faith. The erasing of the qualitative difference between Marxist and Hegelian dialectics is seen ...in the author's unrestricted declaration that the dialectic leads to atheism because it undermines the logical preconditions of idealism. We believe that the dialectic as such is not able to do this, but only materialism as theory, as the right answer to the basic question of philosophy. The dialectic is naturally connected inseparably with dialectical materialism....

"One cannot agree with the author's assertion that every category contains an element...of the law, that it expresses a part of the universal legality and that we can identify categories and laws within certain limits. Although this is valid in many cases, there are certainly categories which express no law. Also the author's assertion

C-0-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

that the spiritualistic standpoint is not so far removed from that of metaphysical materialism because the spiritual conception of subject as soul, spirit, etc., is only the transfer of the metaphysical idea to an inseparable thing in the sphere of psychic activity, betrays the author's unpartisan behavior on the basic question of philosophy and betrays an attempt to make the methodological viewpoint absolute. The author says that certain categories can have two or more meanings and that partisanship means, at one time, the expression of subjective class and party interest, and, at another time, it means the social and class determination of thought. In Marxist philosophy, however, partisanship cannot have two or more meanings. Marxist partisanship is the expression of the highest objectivity, because Marxist philosophy is the only scientific philosophic system which imparts truly objective knowledge of the most general laws of development of nature, society, and human thought....

"We cannot agree with the author's further characterization of functional dependence as a form of causality which has been robbed...of several traits. 'Wherever it is a question of 'conditioning,' 'function,' 'dependence,' 'correlate,' 'influence,' the concern is with a more or less diluted...derivative of universal causality.' We point, in this connection, to the attempts primarily of the neopositivists to substitute functional relations for causality. These attempts, however, fail through the fact that a mathematical function as the expression of reciprocal relations of sizes is reversible at any time -- a fact which is not true in a causal process. The function concept signifies a conceptual-logical connection, while the causal process signifies a real connection.

"...For Cvekl the chief object of dispute is not the contrast between materialism and idealism, but that between metaphysics and dialectics -- a fact which ultimately approximates a denial of the philosophic position of Marxism. This attempt [of Cvekl's] leads directly to attacks against the 'dogmatists' in a revisionistic evaluation of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. We have, in general, the impression that the author sees the chief danger in the international workers movement, in dogmatism and not in revisionism, although the 'Declaration of the Consultation of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties of Socialist Countries' (Moscow, 14-16 November 1957) scientifically showed the exact opposite. This was again affirmed recently in Point 14 of the Seventh Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party....

"J. Cvekl stresses in the foreword to the second Czechoslovak edition that his work was written at the time of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. 'It [the book] arose in an atmosphere which was characterized by sharp criticism of the various forms of dogmatism, by criticism of ossification, of the underestimation of non-Marxist philosophy and science, criticism of the vulgar unification of philosophy and politics, criticism of the mistakes connected with Stalin; [it arose in an atmosphere] characterized by a renewed interest in the Leninist philosophic heritage....'

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"There is no doubt that the personality cult involving Stalin impeded the development of Marxist-Leninist theory. However, Stalin's works represent a worthwhile enrichment...and outstanding popularization of Marxism-Leninism. Above all, the works of Stalin are distinguished by their strict partisan character and the connection they draw between philosophy and politics -- a fact which apparently displeases Cvekl very much.... We also miss in Cvekl a factual and fair evaluation of Stalin. For instance, the author considers...Stalin's works on dialectical and historical materialism to be 'a characteristic view of dialectical materialism in which priority is given to brevity...and popularity, rather than to the ideal richness, philosophic erudition, enthusiasm, and careful reference to the development of philosophy and the sciences which distinguish the works...of the founders of Marxism-Leninism.'

"We cannot share this view. We see in Stalin's works a significant contribution toward connecting Marxist philosophy with the concrete social and political problems and toward popularizing Marxist philosophy....

"We also consider Cvekl's objections to Lysenko as little justified as his objections to Stalin. Outstanding Soviet philosophers, such as Leonov, Rosental, and others, are almost [totally] discredited when the author writes, 'Larger synthesizing [synthetische] works, namely Soviet works, for example by Leonov, Rosental, and others, have a predominantly popular and derivative character and become obsolete very fast.'

"The reviewer is very well acquainted with the works of these Soviet authors and can say that...they and other works of Soviet philosophers play a positive role not only in the Soviet Union, but also in the People's Democracies and in the GDR.... We should also like to take this opportunity to ask the Dietz Verlag [publishers] how it could, [as recently as] in 1959, permit the publication of this profoundly revisionistic work by Cvekl." -- Erhard Albrecht (Greifswald)

What was termed additional information on the background of the 1957 Harich trials and subsequent events involving the Schirdewan Wollweber-Selbmann faction, appeared in the 1 July 1960 issue of the West German SBZ Archiv in an article by Heinz Zoeger, a member of the Harich group, who recently fled to the West following his release from prison.

According to the article, the following facts had up to now not been completely established" The trials were "show trials" serving as preparation for the later dispute with the Schirdewan group. The trials were also Ulbricht's rebuff to certain leading groups in the USSR which wanted a change in Soviet policy toward Germany following Stalin's death. Assertions made in the indictment that members of the group wanted to change the situation in East Germany by force were, it says, a complete invention of the State Security Service. "The juristic prosecution of the

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Harich group was not legally justified...and even SED (Socialist Unity Party) lawyers doubted the legitimacy of the trials.... Ulbricht himself later termed the trials a preventive measure." Ulbricht was, according to the article, fully aware of the views of the Schirawan group but did not venture to oppose them until Moscow had regained the upper hand, following the revolts in Hungary and Poland. "It is noteworthy that Ulbricht himself, even then, treated members of the Schirawan group with caution and still does -- a fact which is in complete contradiction to the seriousness of the charges against them."

In a dispatch of 27 July 1960, the West German publication, Informationsbuero West, reported the following denunciation which the SED has made of "revisionist tendencies" (i.e., attempts to dilute the atheistic teachings) carried on in the East German youth consecration program.

"Eighty-eight percent of the school graduates, i.e., about 135,000 boys and girls, took part in youth consecration this year, according to a report of the 'Central Committee for Youth Consecration.'

"According to the report, the position of the Catholic and Evangelical Churches toward 'youth consecration' is said to have led to 'revisionist elements in the youth consecration movement.' The report said there were [SED] officials who wanted to clothe the youth consecration program 'in ideologically neutral dress'; for them the program was 'too polemical.' The party has had a discussion with these 'revisionists' and has 'overcome' them. Among some of the elements which the Central Committee of the SED terms 'revisionist' are the attempts to replace the term 'youth consecration' by 'youth celebration' [Jugendfeier] and to hand out to participants a book called Unser Deutschland (Our Germany), in place of the book Weltall-Erde-Mensch (Universe, Earth, Man), the former 'offering no clear philosophical orientation.' The report adds that 'sectarian elements' have also arisen in the youth consecration movement. Such elements demanded that only children who had no religious affiliation could participate in youth consecration. But the SED, it [the report] said, declares that 'under the conditions of the worker and peasant state, all children must participate.'

III. HUNGARY

Revisionist Pressures on Literary Policy, Peaceful Coexistence Line; Lukacs in New Light

The August 1960 issue of the Hungarian trade union monthly Munka restated and defended the party's right to guide culture: "The revisionists denied and they still deny the right of the party and state

C-0-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

to direct all areas of cultural life and to intervene in the course of cultural development. A denial of party and state guidance always means a support of bourgeois culture as opposed to socialist culture." But in closing, the article denied that this meant centralized control; rather, it merely pointed up the need for "education" of artists.

Lajos Kiss, an editor of the Szeged literary monthly Tiszataj, which has always been a stronghold for pure party line literature, contributed to Budapest literary journals twice in August, apparently as part of the antimodernism campaign which has still not forced modernists out of their leading literary positions in Budapest. In the 12 August 1960 issue of Elet es Irodalom, the weekly of the Hungarian Writers Federation, Kiss took up the problem of "literature and technology," and he attacked, in the person of Lajos Maroti (a young scientist-poet who publishes frequently in Elet es Irodalom), those who fail to see the radical novelty of the new socialist reality. "In the final analysis, this [denial of radical novelty] involves a deeply embedded bourgeois remnant and not at all 'eternal principles' of life," Kiss wrote in closing. In the August issue of Kortars Kiss took up the problem of modernism as such "We have often experienced in the current modernism debate that there are midwives in our new literature who would like by clever intrigues to replace the healthy new-born children [i.e., socialist realism] with the sickly offspring of old, sick parents -- of capitalism." Later, in his criticism of the various forms of modernism, Kiss wrote: "Others say that the changes taking place in reality must be reflected in the content of literature.... But where do the believers in modernism see these changes? In the achievements of technology and the natural sciences.... 'Gestalts' ['forms'] in a phenomenological or metaphysical sense, 'configurations'] hitherto unknown are coming into being.... The newest historical fruit of our century is -- 'the atomic era.' This means the beginning of the absolute dictatorship of technology and the natural sciences." Kiss rejected these views, calling them symptoms of the panic among intellectuals in the "dying" bourgeois world. By way of Heisenberg, "an outstanding representative of physical idealism", Kiss carries his argument against Plato: "In the century of the victory of materialism, Plato and his philosophy can only play the role of Don Quixote.... The above ideologies, whether expressed in philosophy or literature, have common roots with bourgeois reality. In place of law they put possibility, in place of matter they put a mathematical formula, in place of content they put form. Thus they try to deny the necessity of the destruction of bourgeois society. Technicalizing, modernist literature capitulates before the agonizing bourgeois society."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The August issue of Munka also acknowledged revisionist pressures on the "peaceful coexistence" line. After restating and supporting the Soviet line on peace and disarmament, the author, Gyorgy Fono, attacked Western proponents of a more aggressive foreign policy (the US author William S. Schlamm and the West Germans in general) and Western spokesmen who point out the inapplicability and falsehood of Marxist theories (Averell Harrimann, George Kennan, Adolf Berle, and Mendes-France). Fono then attacked the "much more dangerous" revisionists: "Hiding behind the mask of 'true creative Marxism' they spread what are essentially the same views.... They assert that a uniform socialist transformation is taking place throughout the world,...and that the theses of Marx, Engels, and Lenin apply only to the past." Fono attacks Strachey and Coal for their theories of an "administrative revolution" and he attacks Guy Mollet for his theory of the "evaporation" of capitalist property: "According to them, there can be a 'just distribution' of income and the concept of class is being eliminated. Naturally they deny the class struggle too. Together with the Hungarian Gyorgy Lukacs they attempt to prove in various ways that the struggle between classes with opposed interests is being forced into the background in our day by the struggle between the believers in peace and war or, in other cases, democracy and dictatorship." Fono cites an article by the "well established Hungarian revisionist" Ferenc Fejto in the 10 March France Observateur which noted that "the policy of relaxation increases the possibilities of the revisionists," and Fono cites an article by S. King Hall (Liverpool Daily Post) which called revisionism "our best ally in the cold war." Fono remarked: "We could not have put it more clearly! Fono closes with a ritualistic repetition of the Soviet line: "Today, socialism is peace.... Today, socialism is irresistably winning throughout the world."

Curiously but significantly, just as Fono in Munka was repeating the old charge of revisionism against Lukacs, the literary weekly Elet es Irodalom (5 August 1960), quoting the French Communist Pierre Daix, was charging Lukacs with the opposite sins of dogmatism and schematism. If Daix had been writing in Hungary he could have been classified as a liberal and modernist, a defender of literary freedom, of national influences on literature, and of international cultural exchange. The Hungarian reviewer, Gyorgy Balazs, quoted Daix as follows: "Lukacs, with his rigid categories, burns up every bridge between the literature of the nonsocialist part of the world and the...literature of peoples building socialism." This is just the opposite of the usual charge brought against Lukacs in print. Balazs is careful to note that this view of Lukacs is from the French viewpoint and he does not openly suggest a Hungarian re-evaluation of Lukacs. But the appearance of his article clearly shows the divergence between the viewpoints of the literary weekly Elet es Irodalom and the more orthodox party line publications, and it suggests that French Communists might have a disturbing influence on ideological stands taken by parties behind the Iron Curtain.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

IV. RUMANIA

Duties of Literary Criticism in Fighting Revisionism

In his report to the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers Party in June 1960, party First Secretary Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej called the ideological and educational struggle the principal field for the class struggle in Rumania at present. Discussing the role of literary criticism in the class struggle, two publications of the Rumanian Writers Union cite the dangers of revisionism in literature and the duties of critics in combating it.

An editorial in the July issue of Viata Romineasca stresses "... the special tasks of aesthetics and literary criticism in countering the influences of various idealistic and revisionist theories with the steel armor...of Marxist-Leninist ideology..."

Writing in Gazeta Literara of 28 July, Sevin Bratu says: "...As a result of the prompt action of literary criticism, the revisionist disease, detected and destroyed at its first attempts at erosion, could not make headway in our country. Following the call of our party, our criticism has learned how to overcome any indication of departure from its active social function of vanquishing the bourgeois snares of formal analyses, of archivistic, apolitical historiography, of philosophical speculations divorced from reality, and to take a firm attitude against liberalistic and objectivistic tendencies which accept the heritage of the past in a block and give a professorial evaluation of our new literature, not using the party spirit as a basis..."

V. YUGOSLAVIA

Coexistence and War

The "revisionist" Yugoslavs appear to enjoy a certain amount of "peaceful coexistence" with at least one member of the socialist camp, as far as historical accounts on Yugoslavia are concerned. Specifically, the Yugoslav correspondent in Krakow reviews, in the 31 July 1960 issue of Vjesnik, all the items on Yugoslavia in the Polish general encyclopedia, which was first published in 1959, and concludes by saying that "we can state that 'Yugoslavia' have been treated well and impartially in the Mala Encyklopedia Powszechna." This contrasts with past anguished complaints in the press that Yugoslav subjects, particularly Yugoslav Communist activities, have been distorted, misrepresented, or even omitted in publications of other socialist countries, such as the revised edition of the Soviet encyclopedia.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In the disputes between the East and the West, the Yugoslavs regularly back the Soviet position, their support ranging from strong approval to mere acquiescence, according to published evidence. However, this does not prevent them from indirectly criticizing in print Soviet actions when they run counter to the Yugoslav position or threaten it. As professed strong supporters of peaceful coexistence, the Yugoslavs reflect in their press a concern with the deterioration of the international situation since the collapse of the Paris summit conference. A Nova Makedonija writer in the newspaper's 31 July 1960 issue chides the great powers for lip service to the principle of coexistence. He notes that "comprehension and interpretation of the policy of coexistence are varied. Many consider coexistence as a temporary necessity and interpret it as 'some kind of life of peoples and states' or as a 'temporary lull or maneuver during which each seeks to outwit the other.' Objectively viewed, such conceptions...represent an expression of conscious or unconscious opposition to the true and real policy of active peaceful coexistence...which means the final rejection of force, oppression, and war as methods and means for solving controversial problems and conflicts; it means noninterference in the internal problems of other nations and countries....

"Sad to say, all do not pursue this practice, particularly certain great powers. In the final analysis, the May failure in Paris was nothing other than the result of nonadherence to the principle of coexistence in practice." It should be noted that the writer does not specifically charge the failure to the US alone.

Red China's position is ridiculed when the author writes that "insistence is now again being expressed that it be proved that the 'nature of imperialism,' regardless of changed historical conditions, inevitably leads to aggression and war. From this, the quite absurd (but still dangerous) conclusion is reached that wars cannot be avoided through 'fruitless' talks with imperialists; this (translated into the language of practice) means that one should prepare for a military miscalculation. Of course, this theory meets with extensive condemnation, especially from the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers Party...and the speech of Premier Khrushchev at the congress."

Returning again to the theme of active coexistence, the writer submits that "at the present stage of progress in composing international incidents...the declarations and comforting formulations are not satisfactory which hold that the door to bargaining and talks is not closed but only 'ajar.' It is time,...by consistently applying and honoring the principles of coexistence, to produce an atmosphere of mutual trust.... The great powers, especially those at the head of the blocs, should put in concrete form their proclamations of readiness for agreement, their good will, and their devotion to peace, at least with the introduction of a genuine policy of coexistence and with genuine agreement in the interest of peace and all of international society."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

A major rebuttal to the Chinese Communist attacks on Yugoslav "revisionism" has appeared in the form of a book-length discourse, Socijalizam i Rat (Socialism and War), by Edvard Kardelj, Vice-President and leading theoretician of Yugoslavia. It has also appeared serially in the 12-20 August 1960 issues of Borba. (An English translation is available in the FBID Daily Report: USSR and East Europe, Supplement No 10, 2 September 1960.) The following Yugoslav review of the book in the 25 August 1960 issue of Kommunist highlights the main points made by Kardelj.

"This discourse by Edvard Karjelj throws light not only on the sources and real meaning of the unprincipled attacks and the unrestrained hue and cry of the leading circles of the Communist Party of China on the foreign policy of socialist Yugoslavia, but also on the essence of the basic conceptions which permeate the present international policy of China and the historical consequence which approbation of these conceptions would evoke in the development of modern socialism.

"Kardelj has subjected to very comprehensive and documented analysis the political course which the Chinese leadership has proclaimed and very stubbornly implemented in the past several years. This analysis has served him as a basis not only for confirming the objective values and essence of this course, but also for a positive exegesis of the views of the Association of Communists of Yugoslavia on the essential aspects of current international relations and the burning problems of the further development of socialism under present conditions.

"Confronting the views of the authors of the Chinese attacks on Yugoslavia with the views of the Marxist-Leninist classics on the questions of war and peace, the factors of socialist revolution and the development of new social relations, the ways and forms of the change of capitalist society into socialist, and the contradictions of the transitional period, Kardelj has proven the total unjustifiability of inviting Chinese writers of articles to be loyal to the science of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and he has shown the open subjectivism of the most important Chinese theses, the willful interpretation, and the impudent distortion of many altogether clear and unambiguous positions of the founders of scientific socialism.

"The examination of the ideological value of many of the positions of the Chinese Communists shows that they cannot be defended as being scientific, Marxist, and socialist. However, their basis, the reasons which gave them birth, and their sociohistorical consequences have been interpreted through the Marxist method. Kardelj accomplished this by analyzing the objective movements of contemporary reality and the profound changes the world is undergoing in our time.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The most important theme of Kardelj's discourse is the question of the inevitability of war today and, in connection with this, the meaning and substance of the policy of coexistence from the viewpoint of the struggle for socialism....

"Kardelj's conclusion, based on a condensed summary of the socio-political changes of the last decade, is expressed thus: '...the fate of peace does not depend only on the forces and will of imperialism, but also on the policy and the subjective conceptions of the decisive socialist factors.'

"Analyzing the internal logic of the Chinese views on the inevitability of war and the reality of the policy of coexistence, Kardelj also considers their theories on the ways and forms of socialist revolution, on just and unjust wars, on the relations between socialist countries and their prospects.

"Besides the ideological absurdities of these theories, the author has shown the legal and rational bond between the foreign policy orientation of the Chinese leaders and the given inner structure of Chinese society and its contradictions. Finally, Kardelj has pointed out the objective assumptions which can influence Chinese socialism sooner or later to master and leave behind its present vacillation."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 4. WESTERN EUROPE

DENMARK

Dissident Criticism of Soviet "Rocket-Rattling"

Editorially, under the heading "Rocket-Rattling," SF (weekly organ of the Danish dissident Socialist People's Party) notes in its issue of 29 July 1960 that in the preceding two weeks the Soviet government had found occasion to threaten the US and "its base countries" with rockets twice, and Belgium and its allies with conventional military intervention once. This, the editorial observes, was a far cry from the Camp David days, when Khrushchev and Eisenhower jointly conceded that in our day international conflicts cannot be settled by war.

It carefully explains that the change in Soviet foreign policy from the restraint which characterized Soviet criticism of the US in the period just before and after Khrushchev's visit to the US, and which Peiping indirectly attacked so sharply, to the currently bellicose Soviet language has been prompted not by Chinese pressure, but by the "incorrigibly aggressive policy" of the US. The editorial leaves no doubt that SF views the situation from the Soviet standpoint. And as if to prime the reader with forensic ammunition, a wide choice of US moves and positions are listed, apparently implying an axiomatic premise that all US acts and postures are "aggressive." At the same time, however, only two instances are deemed necessary to illustrate Soviet "patience and reasonableness": postponement of a settlement of the Berlin issue, and Soviet support in Security Council meetings of UN intervention in the Congo.

Having thus laid the toughened attitude of a "patient and reasonable" Soviet government to US "imperialist aggressiveness," SF permits itself, somewhat condescendingly, to criticize Soviet "rocket rattling," which, although "doubtless only a scare policy," it considers ill-advised. "Since it scarcely can be taken seriously, it does not frighten anyone," the editorial says, "and if it were seriously meant, it would not solve a single problem." Soviet rockets, it points out, can guarantee neither Soviet security nor Cuban independence, but only the destruction of most of the earth, including the USSR and Cuba; the new Soviet "brink-of-war" policy "merely heightens international tension, fails to further the anti-imperialist revolution, promotes imperialist, solidarity, and strengthens Adenauer's positions, but does not solve a single crucial question."

* * *

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L